

**From:** Wu, Jennifer  
**To:** Fowler, Jamie; Curtin, James; Havard, James; Monschein, Eric; Martinez, Menchu; Lewicki, Chris; Psyk, Christine; Croxton, Dave; Byrne, Jennifer; Hanson, Kent (ENRD); Schroer, Lee; Labiosa, Rochelle; Palmer, John; Chemerys, Ruth  
**CC:** Wade, Alexis; Stevens, Clifford (ENRD); Lidgard, Michael; Burgess, Karen  
**Sent:** 10/21/2014 11:51:16 PM  
**Subject:**  
**Attachments:**

**Non-Responsive**

**Non-Responsive**

I talked with Jamie this afternoon, and she had a few questions on funding and CZARA. We'll be more specific on funding requests and get something to you in the next couple of weeks. I might talk again with Eric and/or Jamie to make sure we're on the right track.

For CZARA and the Midcoast TMDL, there's a bit of history to go over, but the short of it is that the State's work on the Midcoast TMDL didn't meet what we originally agreed to under CZARA (enforceable mechanisms, prescriptive, numeric BMPs). Because of that, the delays in the State completing the TMDL tied to CZARA SA dates, and EPA's disapproval of the temp NCC which impacted the State's ability to write a temperature TMDL and impose riparian buffers on forestlands (a key to meeting gaps in CZARA's forestry program), the State decided to decouple the Midcoast TMDL from CZARA. That's why we're in the position of having to disapprove the CZARA program.

**Non-Responsive**

the TMDL while not going as far as we'd like under CZARA is still a significant step forward on TMDLs and should be the most comprehensive and detailed TMDL in the State with their implementation-ready TMDL approach.

**Non-Responsive**

**Non-Responsive**

, and it's above and beyond what they have to do and have done. They also have most of their staff on this (like us), so we think it's the right TMDL to invest in. We can definitely talk more about this, as the

**Non-Responsive**

Talk to you all soon - Jenny

**Non-Responsive**

# **Non-Responsive**

# **Non-Responsive**

# **Non-Responsive**